

FEBRUARY 1, 2012 – AUGUST 30, 2012

MONTANA STRIVING READERS PROJECT APPLICATION

DUE DATE: POSTMARKED NO LATER THAN DECEMBER 15, 2011



opi.mt.gov

MONTANA OFFICE OF PUBLIC INSTRUCTION

DENISE JUNEAU, SUPERINTENDENT

MONTANA STRIVING READERS PROJECT

PO Box 202501

HELENA, MT 59620-2501

WWW.OPI.MT.GOV



February 1, 2012 – August 30, 2012

MONTANA STRIVING READERS PROJECT APPLICATION

Due Date: Postmarked no later than December 15, 2011

Return original and two copies to:

Office of Public Instruction
Attn: Debbie Hunsaker
Montana Striving Readers Project
PO Box 202501
Helena, MT 59620-2501

Funds Available: Approximately \$7,600,000 per year available for awards to eligible districts contingent upon the availability of federal funds. Funds made available from the Department of Education's Striving Readers Grant.

Estimated Range of Awards: \$250,000-\$400,000+ per application each year over a three-year period.

Fiscal Information: Successful projects are expected to operate for three full years. Grant awards will be issued for each budget year within that period. For the current year (FY12), funds will be available February 1, 2012, through August 30, 2012. Continuation funds will be contingent upon sufficient progress in meeting the goals of the program.

Review Process: The application review will be a two-tier process:

Expert reviewers will evaluate and score the applications; and
The Office of Public Instruction (OPI) will make necessary policy decisions regarding the awards.

The rubric specifies that each of the 13 parts must be evaluated and scored separately. Each of the parts must receive a numerical score that falls in the "Meets Standard" or "Exemplary Plan" range in order for the applicant to receive a subgrant award. The total number of points awarded for all parts will be used to further distinguish relative strengths of the application. Along with the numerical score, each reviewer will list the strengths and weaknesses of the responses of each part. Successful applicants will be notified by February 1, 2012.

Application: See pages 2 and 3 for additional requirements. One original and two copies of the complete application package must be submitted. Staple or binder clip each complete set of application materials; do **not** use binders, plastic covers, folders, dividers, tabs, etc. Submission by fax or electronic mail will not be accepted. The original must include an original signature on all required documents.

Assistance: Contact Debbie Hunsaker, (406) 444-0733, dhunsaker@mt.gov; Kath Tiefenthaler, (406) 444-1872, ktiefenthaler@mt.gov; Tara Ferriter Smith, (406) 444-0748, tferriter@mt.gov; Terri Barclay,

MONTANA STRIVING READERS PROJECT REQUIREMENTS

Each Head Start, special education preschool, and school awarded Striving Readers funds will meet the following requirements.

Administrative Support

On-site Leadership Implementation Team, which includes the principal(s) attending bimonthly statewide workshops in Helena (\$2,000 per meeting)

Use of iWalkthrough system (Approx. \$1,000-\$3,500 per school/per year)

On-site Leadership Implementation Team must be present during on-site support from an Instructional Consultant and the OPI Implementation team member as identified in the preset agenda

Personnel: Costs will only be allowed if personnel directly support implementation of the required activities and if the sustainability of those components can be justified.

Instructional Consultant: One Instructional Consultant must be written in each application. One Instructional Consultant will be assigned to each Head Start, special education preschool, and school based on needs identified within the self-assessment and subgrant application (\$2,500 per day).

Equipment

ipad for each Building Leadership team member (\$800 per team member)

Flip Cameras (1 per every 5 teachers) (\$300 per camera)

Additional technology in subgrant application priority

Assessment and Data Management: Head Starts, special education preschools, and schools will be required to adopt the assessments identified in Tables 1 and 2 to ensure the evaluation and effectiveness of the Montana Striving Readers Project (MSRP). ISIP: istation's indicators of progress, an Internet delivered computer adaptive testing system will also be required, unless DIBLES or AIMSweb is already being used.

Purchase and administer assessment instruments and data management systems identified in Tables 1 and 2

ISIP (\$5 per student per year) or DIBLES or AIMSweb (if already established)

MY Access! Writing for 8th and 11th grades (\$20 per student/per year)

Additional assessment materials in subgrant application

Table 1: MSRP Required Assessments

Type	Description	MSRP Subgrantee Required Assessments
SCREENING	<u>What:</u> Quick efficient measures known to be strong indicators that predict student performance in a specific subject. Assessments are given at grade-level skill. <u>Who:</u> All PreK-12 students <u>When:</u> Beginning, middle, and end of year or upon arrival	ISIP (PreK-10) DIBELS Next (K-6) AIMSweb (K-6) MYAccess! Writing Assessment (8 and 11) MontCAS State Test Scores from previous school year (3-10)
PROGRESS MONITORING	<u>What:</u> Frequent measurement to determine if students are making adequate academic progress <u>Who:</u> All PreK-12 students <u>When:</u> Should be administered as part of the instructional routine: Tier 1 every 6 weeks, Tier 2 every 4 weeks, Tier 3 every 2 weeks	ISIP (PreK-10) DIBELS Next (K-6) AIMSweb (K-8) Program assessments Intervention program assessments
DIAGNOSTIC	<u>What:</u> Individually administered assessments to provide in-depth information regarding a student's skills and instructional needs <u>Who:</u> K-12 students who are not responding efficiently to instruction <u>When:</u> As needed through data analysis	Program diagnostic assessments Intervention program diagnostic assessments
OUTCOME	<u>What:</u> Assessments which provide an evaluation of the effectiveness of instruction and indicate student year-end achievement when compared to grade-level performance standards <u>Who:</u> K-12 <u>When:</u> End of school year	MontCAS State Assessment (3-10) ACT Reading and English- (12) ISIP (PreK-10) DIBELS (K-6) AIMSweb (K-6) MY Access! Writing Assessment (8 and 11)

Table 2: MSRP Assessment Timeline

MSRP Assessment	Grade							
	Pre-K	K-3	4-6	7-8	9-10	3-8, 10	8, 11	12
ISIP Early Reading	F/W/S	F/W/S						
ISIP Vocabulary	F/W/S							
DIBELS		F/W/S	F/W/S					
AIMSweb		F/W/S	F/W/S	F/W/S				
ISIP Advanced Reading			F/W/S	F/W/S	F/W/S			
MontCAS						S		
MY Access!							F/S	
ACT								S

F=Fall; W=Winter; S=Spring;

Professional Development

The On-site Leadership Implementation Team will attend state-level training on professional development (PD) modules provided by the Instructional Consultants and OPI Implementation Team. See Tables 3 and 4 for additional details.

The On-site Leadership Implementation Team, Instructional Consultant Team, and OPI Implementation Team will use the self-assessment to determine the exact content of the professional development (PD) modules to present to the staff. Then, the teams will use the action plan to decide in what format (e.g., staff meeting, team meeting, before school, after school) the content will be presented to staff and to which staff. Finally, the Implementation teams will work on-site with staff, through coaching to effectively implement the practices into instruction.

Table 3: Professional Development Modules for Years 1 and 2 (see Table 19 for activities, indicators, and responsibilities)

Year 1		
Modules	Birth through Age 5, Elementary Schools, Middle Schools, High Schools	Presenters at Statewide Workshops: MT OPI Implementation Team, Instructional Consultant Implementation Team, (see Table 13 & 14 for expertise)
R+I Early Childhood	Birth through Age 5	Tara Ferriter-Smith M.Ed, Dian Prestwich PhD. Ed.
R+I Elementary School	Elementary Schools	Gwen Poole, Terri Barclay M.Ed.
R+I Secondary	Middle Schools and High Schools	Frank Smith M.Ed, Debbie Hunsaker M.Ed.
Using Data to Make Instructional Decisions	Birth through Age 5 Elementary Schools Middle Schools High Schools	Debbie Hunsaker M.Ed.
Year 2		
Preschool Literacy	Birth through Age 5	Tara Ferriter-Smith M.Ed, Dian Prestwich PhD. Ed.
Elementary Literacy	Elementary Schools	Gwen Poole, Terri Barclay M.Ed.
Adolescent Literacy	Middle and High Schools	Debbie Hunsaker M.Ed, Kim Marcum M.Ed.
Content Enhancement Routines	Middle Schools High Schools	Keith Lenz Ph.D, Debbie Hunsaker M.Ed.

Table 4: Coaching Support		
Activity	Intensity	Description
Present Module Content (determined by self-assessment needs and action plan)	Day-long workshops will be held (see Table 11) for workshop titles and required attendance of LEAs and Head Start programs	On-site workshops led by the Implementation teams will feature demonstrations, discussions, and guided practice using the PD modules (see Table 11). In-depth, on-going training will be provided to support the implementation and to analyze the organization and use of the Modules. Teachers will share videotapes of their own exemplary practices.
Group Coaching (determined by self-assessment needs and action plan)	Based on student and teacher needs	The Implementation teams will review specific aspects of the PD modules with teacher groups, as identified within the action plan. Educators may review content, including video clips, build background knowledge, or practice strategies taught in the PD module. The PD modules can be reviewed at any time within the continuous improvement cycle.
In-class coaching (determined by self-assessment needs and action plan)	Based on student and teacher data (iWalkthrough) and teacher needs	The MT OPI Implementation Team, Instructional Consultant Implementation Team, and On-site Leadership Implementation Team will help teachers translate the information presented at on-site workshops into change in classroom practice through planning, modeling, side-by-side co-teaching, observation and feedback. Through ongoing consultation, teachers will compile a portfolio of videos, observational forms, and reflective notes documenting their progress. The sharing of those videos and reflections will begin in Year 2.
Teacher Reflection and Portfolio Development (determined by self-assessment needs and action plan)	1-hour per month (Approx. 10 hours/year)	Technology: Through ongoing consultation, teachers compile a portfolio of videos, observational forms, and reflective notes documenting their progress toward mastering the elements and ultimately meeting the goals (see Table 1) of the MSRP.

MONTANA STRIVING READERS PROJECT

The application must include:

- | | |
|--------------|--|
| Section I. | Cover Page signed by the Authorized Representative |
| Section II. | Grant Proposal Narrative (Parts A-M) |
| Section III. | Budget and Budget Narrative |
| Section IV. | Staff Assurances from each school and early childhood center |

**The original and two copies of the completed grant application must be postmarked
by December 15, 2011.**

Return application packets to:
Office of Public Instruction
Attn: Debbie Hunsaker
Montana Striving Readers Project
PO Box 202501
Helena, MT 59620-2501

**BECAUSE OF THE POSSIBILITY OF ELECTRONIC MESSAGING FAILURE,
FAXED APPLICATIONS WILL NOT BE ACCEPTED.**

For technical assistance regarding your application, please contact: Debbie Hunsaker, (406) 444-0733, dhunsaker@mt.gov; Kath Tiefenthaler, (406) 444-1872, ktiefenthaler@mt.gov; Tara Ferriter-Smith, (406) 444-0748, tferriter@mt.gov; Terri Barclay, (406) 444-0753, tbarclay2@mt.gov; Cynthia Green, (406) 444-0729, cgreen4@mt.gov, or http://opi.mt.gov/Streamer/Instructional_Innovations/index.php.

GENERAL INFORMATION

Purpose of the Montana Striving Readers Project

Table 5: Goals of Montana Striving Readers Project (MSRP)	
Goal	Description of Goal
1.	To further develop and implement a MT Literacy Plan that makes provisions for literacy at all age/grade levels, including challenging transitions from preschool to elementary, elementary to middle school, and middle school to high school are aligned to MT Standards for English Language Arts and MT Early Learning Guidelines, involves collaborating with other agencies, and addresses literacy across the content areas.
2.	To run a rigorous, competitive subgrant application process, which will select LEAs (district-operated K-12 schools and special education preschools) and Head Start programs that have a high capacity to implement comprehensive, effective literacy instruction that meets the needs of disadvantaged children and students.
3.	To improve school readiness and success from birth through grade 12 in the area of language and literacy development. For disadvantaged students, the MSRP will set and achieve the following targets: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increase the percentage of participating four year olds who achieve significant gains in oral language skills as identified by the ISIP early reading assessments • Increase the percentage of participating fifth grade students who meet or exceed proficiency on the MT English language arts assessment, the MontCAS • Increase the percentage of participating eighth grade students who meet or exceed proficiency on the MT English language arts assessment, the MontCAS. • Increase the percentage of participating high school students who meet or exceed proficiency on the MT English language arts assessment, the MontCAS. • Increase the percentage of all subgroups including American Indian, disadvantaged, and limited-English proficient students, as well as students with disabilities.
4.	To fully implement a data-based decision making process to collect, analyze, and use high- quality data in a timely manner to assess the effectiveness of the MT Literacy Plan in meeting the targets in Goal 3, both statewide and at the LEAs and Head Starts.
5.	To decrease the percentage of participating high school students who drop out of high school and, therefore increase the graduation rate at all participating high schools.

Eligible Applicants: Criteria for LEA eligibility

1. District has 50% or more students eligible for free/reduced-price meals: or
2. District has an on-time graduation rate of < or =80% (5% below AYP benchmark of 85%).

AND, additionally, the LEA must meet one of the following:

- District has a low-income student group not meeting AYP target in Reading; or
- District is identified for Title I improvement; or
- District has >12% students with disabilities.

Criteria for eligibility for schools within a district: (A district may only include up to two schools per grade span from elementary, one middle school, and one high school.)

1. School has 50% percent or more students eligible for free/reduced-price meals; or
2. High school has an on-time graduation rate of < or =80%.

AND, additionally, the school must meet one of the following:

- School has low-income student group not meeting AYP target in Reading; or

- School is identified for Title I improvement; or
- School has >12% students with disabilities.

Eligible Applicants: Criteria for Early Learning Programs eligibility

- Program is an established Head Start; or
- Program is an established Early Head Start; or
- Program is an established district operated special education preschool.

Application Available/Competition Open: November 1, 2011.

Deadline for Submission or Applications: Postmarked by December 15, 2011

Applications may not be faxed. The following are accepted for proof of submission:

1. a legibly dated U.S. Postal Service postmark; or
2. a legible mail receipt with the date of mailing stamped by the U.S. Postal Service; or
3. a dated shipping label, invoice, or receipt from a commercial carrier.

To be considered for funding, applications, forms with original signatures and two copies should be mailed or delivered by hand or express courier delivery no later than 5:00 p.m. on December 15, 2011, to the following:

Office of Public Instruction
Attn: Debbie Hunsaker
Montana Striving Readers Project
1227 11th Avenue
PO Box 202501
Helena, MT 59620-2501

Private School Participation: Funds awarded through these subgrants are subject to the requirements of Section 14503 of ESEA P.L. 108-382 (Participation by Private School Children and Teachers) and the regulations in 34 CFR 299, Subpart E. The statute and regulations require that subgrantees provide private school children and their teachers, or other educational personnel, the services and benefits of the program on an equitable basis with public school children and teachers.

General Education Provisions Act (GEPA):

Local applications must indicate clear and concise steps that will be taken to assure equitable access to and participation in the Montana Striving Readers Project activities regardless of gender, race/ethnicity, national origin, or disability of age.

GRANT APPLICATION NARRATIVE REQUIREMENTS

Applicants must respond in sequence to the Section II - Grant Narrative Parts A-M with no more than 45 pages in total (not including worksheets).

If the district or school believes the answer is provided in response to another question, that cross-reference should be supplied.

The required components of each narrative follow the question.

The following format should be used:

- one-inch margins
- double-spaced
- 12-point proportional type or font
- All pages numbered
- No appendices attached

Grants written in whole or part by vendors will not be accepted.

Grant Application Narrative Sections

Section II.

- Part A: Capacity Criterion
- Part B: Needs Assessment Criterion
- Part C: Professional Development Criterion
- Part D: Instruction and Intervention Criterion
- Part E: Assessment and Data-based Decision Making Criterion
- Part F: Language and Text-Rich Learning Environment Criterion
- Part G: GA) Continuous Improvement Process Criterion
GB) Addressing the Needs of Disadvantaged Students
- Part H: Community and Family Involvement Criterion
- Part I: Coherent Strategy Criterion
- Part J: Eligible Schools and Head Start Programs Criterion
- Part K: Strong Evidence Criterion
- Part L: Standards Criterion
- Part M: Competitive Technology Priority

Montana Striving Readers Project Subgrant

The subgrant application is a narrative that addresses 13 aspects (not including budget) of a Head Start and school's Montana Striving Readers Project plan. The subgrant selection criteria are presented for each of the 13 aspects. Each of the 13 aspects (Parts A-M) must receive a score in the "Meets Standard" or "Exemplary Plan" range for the application to be funded.

Reviewers will:

- Evaluate each of the 13 aspects separately;
- indicate whether the proposal "Does Not Meet Standard," "Meets Standard," or describes an "Exemplary Plan";

- give each aspect of total number of points; and
- in bullet form, list the strengths and weaknesses of each aspect.

SECTION I---GENERAL INFORMATION

District Name School (s) Name Early Childhood Center Name (s)	Project Starting Date	Project Ending Date:
Authorized Representative's Name	Title:	Telephone Fax E-Mail
Address	City	ZIP Code

I herby certify that to the best of my knowledge, the information contained in this application is correct; the local Board of Trustees has authorized me, as its representative, to file this application. The Board of Trustees agrees to the Common Assurances on file with the OPI for the **2011-2012** school year and those contained in this application in regard to this grant.

Additional Assurance:

The local education agency (district and school) or Head Start program will follow the written commitments of this grant made by the district or Head Start program and the requirements identified by the Montana Striving Readers Project and the Montana Office of Public Instruction.

Signature of Authorized Representative

Date

For OPI Information/Approval

Date Received

Approved

Amount of Award

Reviewer's Signature_____

Date_____



SECTION II- GRANT NARRATIVE

The total points available for Parts A-M equal 100, with an additional 5 competitive points in Part M, for a total possible of 105 points.

Part A: Capacity Criterion			
The OPI requires LEAs or Head Start Programs to demonstrate capacity for implementing its proposal that includes a strong leadership component and a minimum of 80% buy-in from LEA and Head Start staff. The OPI requires applicants' On-site Leadership Implementation Team to attend all MSRP statewide meetings and workshops. Principals will use the iWalkthrough tool during regular walkthrough observations. In addition, principals are required to meet with the MT OPI Implementation Team and Instructional Consultant Team during on-site support visits. Responses to the following capacity statements will be written into each application and reflect how the On-site Leadership Implementation Teams will:			
1. Clearly define and commit to a 3-5 year Montana Literacy Plan (MLP) through the MT R+I Framework with a minimum buy-in of 80% of LEA and Head Start staff			
2. Clearly define and commit to a 3-5 year Montana Literacy Plan (MLP) through the MT R+I Framework with a minimum buy-in of 80% of LEA and Head Start staff			
3. Communicate a consistent MLP roll-out plan			
4. Identify 3-5 year performance targets			
5. Define annual literacy performance targets			
6. Commit resources including positions, staff, and budget support for supplies and materials to the 3-5 year MLP			
7. Commit resources including positions, staff, and budget support for supplies and materials to the 3-5 year MLP			
8. Allocate time for professional development and time for collaboration among staff, with a focus on literacy achievement and effective literacy instruction			
9. Establish and lead monthly meetings			
10. Conduct weekly, both scheduled and random walk-throughs of all instructional settings			
11. Share knowledge and materials to enhance others' understanding of effective early literacy instruction and embed culturally competent instruction			
12. Provide time for and facilitate collaboration among staff, with a focus on literacy achievement and effective literacy instruction			
Does Not Meet Standard	Meets Standard	Exemplary Plan	Total
0-4	5-8	9-10	
Strengths:		Weaknesses:	

Part B: Needs Assessment Criterion			
The OPI requires that the applicants' utilize self-assessment (Birth through age 5, Elementary, or Secondary) information to identify the current needs used to develop an MLP. The needs assessment information will be written into each application and reflect how its On-site Leadership Implementation Teams will:			
1. Identify systematic needs assessment tools currently in place and then develop plans for utilizing the information gathered through these needs assessments.			
2. Develop the plan for utilizing information gathered in the required self-assessment.			
Does Not Meet Standard	Meets Standard	Exemplary Plan	Total
0-4	5-8	9-10	
Strengths:		Weaknesses:	

Part C: Professional Development Criterion			
The OPI requires On-site Leadership Implementation Teams to attend all Statewide Workshops presented by the MT OPI Implementation Team and the Instructional Consultant Implementation Team. LEAs and Head Start Programs select content from the Professional Development (PD) modules to be shared with the staff at staff meetings, grade-level teacher team meetings, and before/after school meetings. The OPI requires that grade-level teacher team meetings occur weekly for one hour. Additionally, the LEAs create actionable items based on the needs from the self-assessments and all teachers create reflection portfolios. Responses to the following PD statements are written into each application and reflect how On-site Leadership Implementation Teams will:			
1. Prepare and communicate with all educators on an annual MLP professional development plan			
2. Allocate funding and time for professional development opportunities			
3. Base professional development on student needs and goals			
4. Require adequate professional development on evidence-based programs for teaching literacy			
5. Require professional development on the four assessment types and assessment procedures			
6. Require professional development on effective early language and literacy instruction			
7. Ensure educators understand the developmental progression of early language and literacy development (see Appendix 2).			
8. Guarantee systems are in place for providing professional development for new staff with regard to the MLP			
9. Ensure educators have access to systems of support including observations, coaching, mentoring, and problem-solving			
10. Make certain that professional development facilitates the integration of most recent early language and literacy development research into the current teaching practices			
11. Guarantee educators receive Positive Behavior Support professional development that includes classroom management and engagement strategies			
Does Not Meet Standard	Meets Standard	Exemplary Plan	Total
0-4	5-8	9-10	
Strengths:		Weaknesses:	

Part D: Instruction and Intervention Criterion			
The OPI requires applicants' to implement a multi-tiered system of support to meet the needs of all learners with an emphasis for disadvantaged students. Evidence-based curriculum and instructional materials will be aligned with the MT Standards for English Language Arts and implemented using technology (see Part M for competitive priority) and principles of universal design. Responses to the following statements must be written into each application and reflect how its On-site Leadership Implementation Teams will ensure:			
1. Evidence-based literacy programs are being utilized			
2. Educators have the necessary instructional materials to teach the early learning programs			
3. Educators will utilize a multi-tiered system of support to maintain high achievement expectations for all students through evidence-based core instruction.			
4. Educators will utilize a multi-tiered system of support within small groups to differentiate instruction for application of skills, including reteaching, additional practice, or challenge activities			
5. Educators utilize evidence-based intervention instruction aligned with literacy components			
6. Educators have the necessary instructional materials for evidence-based intervention instruction			
7. Educators allocate time to provide early literacy instruction and evidence-based intervention instruction			
8. Educators embed explicit literacy instruction across evidence-based instruction			
9. Educators apply literacy skills throughout the day across all content areas			
10. Educators allocate time for writing about text			
11. Educators teach students the fundamental skills and processes for writing			
12. Educators guide students' use of technology as a component of effective literacy instruction			
Does Not Meet Standard	Meets Standard	Exemplary Plan	Total
0-4	5-8	9-10	
Strengths:		Weaknesses:	

Part E: Assessment and Data-based Decision Making Criterion
The OPI requires applicants' to use the ISIP for screening, progress monitoring, and outcome purposes or DIBELS or AIMSweb at the elementary level if they are already being implemented. In addition, LEAs will use the state assessment MontCAS, ACT Reading and English (grade 12) and the MYAccess! writing assessment (grades 8 -11) for outcome assessments. Descriptive responses about the following assessment and data-based decision making statements will be written into each application:
1. An annual assessment plan has been developed and assessment procedures are clearly in place for the four assessment types
2. A universal screening system is in place to measure and monitor student progress and is shared among staff in a timely manner
3. Multiple assessment measures are used to monitor and modify instruction in order to meet student needs as identified by the four assessment types
4. LEAs utilize state testing data to determine the factors for low performance in subgroups that may be contributing to failure to meet AYP
5. LEAs have a specific plan for improving scores for disadvantaged students
6. Staff member(s) have been identified for collecting and disseminating data to educators in a timely manner
7. Progress monitoring is systematic, documented, and shared with educators in a timely manner
8. Diagnostic procedures are systematic, documented, and shared with educators in a timely manner
9. A school data collection system is in place and technology support is available
10. On-site Leadership Implementation Teams and grade-level Teacher Teams are established and meet

at least twice a month			
11. Fidelity of assessment administration is regularly verified			
12. Individual student data is routinely re-examined to ensure disadvantaged students are making adequate progress			
Does Not Meet Standard	Meets Standard	Exemplary Plan	Total
0-4	5-8	9-10	
Strengths:		Weaknesses:	

Part F: Language and Text-Rich Learning Environment Criterion			
Applicants are required to provide language and text-rich learning environments by teaching and modeling expressive and receptive language through everyday reading, speaking, writing, and print. Language and literacy content must be engaging and provide a variety of activities such as talking about ideas through authentic playful activities, asking purposeful questions, modeling rich vocabulary by describing objects in the room, reading aloud, consulting books for information, reading books for enjoyment, and modeling writing and organization of ideas through charts and graphs. The environment must ensure that students acquire a rich knowledge base that supports the acquisition of vocabulary, the alphabetic principle, and the use of higher-order cognitive skills such as planning, predicting, and drawing inferences. Responses to the following three classroom environment statements must be written into each application:			
1. Describe your current language and text-rich learning program environment			
2. Describe any changes intended for the language and text-rich learning program environment			
3. Describe a timeline of activities, indicators of success, and roles and responsibilities for the first year			
Does Not Meet Standard	Meets Standard	Exemplary Plan	Total
0-2	3-4	5	
Strengths:		Weaknesses:	

Part G: Continuous Improvement Processes Criterion			
Applicants are required to work in collaboration with the MT OPI Implementation Team on a Continuous Improvement Monitoring Process utilizing a seven step problem-solving model: 1) Assess Current Status, 2) Develop a Plan of Change, 3) Implementation of the Plan, 4) Monitor the Implementation Plan, 5) Monitor the Impact of the Plan, 6) Review New Data, and 7) Revise and Refine the Plan. This problem solving process is cyclical and ongoing. LEAs and Head Start Programs will use the self-assessment tool, LEA and Head Start Programs 0-12 Survey (see Appendix 2), and action plans to collaboratively work through this process and develop goals to implement phases of the MT Literacy Plan. Responses to the following three continuous improvement process statements will be written into each application:			
1. Describe continuous improvement processes that are currently in place			
2. Describe how the Continuous Improvement Cycle will be utilized			
3. Describe a timeline of activities, indicators of success, and roles/responsibilities for the first year			
Does Not Meet Standard	Meets Standard	Exemplary Plan	Total
0-2	3-4	5	
Strengths:		Weaknesses:	

Part H: Community and Family Involvement Criterion			
The OPI requires applicants' to meet in October, January, and June with community partnerships to share program data. Responses to the following continuous improvement processes statements will be written into each application and reflect the commitment of LEAs and Head Start Programs to:			
1. Recognize community partnerships in the literacy development of students			
2. Understand the importance of school, family, and community partnerships and nurture reciprocal relationships with families			
3. Have a system in place for helping families support students' learning at home			
4. Have a system in place for effectively communicating with families in various and meaningful ways			
5. Involve parents and/or students in the problem-solving process			
6. Sponsor and promote literacy activities and events			
7. Collaborate with each other and families to ensure smooth transitions from early education through high school			
8. Ensure families and children have opportunities to demonstrate their abilities, skills, and knowledge in any language including students' primary language			
9. Establish and maintain both formal and informal literacy partnerships with families and the private and public sector to provide support to students' development and middle/high school readiness			
10. Recognize parent, community tutoring programs, and volunteers as resources to assist students in acquiring literacy skills			
Does Not Meet Standard	Meets Standard	Exemplary Plan	Total
0-4	5-8	9-10	
Strengths:		Weaknesses:	

Part I: Coherent Strategy Criterion			
The OPI requires applicants' to demonstrate a coherent strategy for leveraging federal, state, and local funds with the LEAs and Head Start programs proposed activities within the application. The following criteria will be written into the application and reflect how LEAs and Head Start Programs will:			
1. Leverage applicant's funds and align proposed literacy activities with other federal, state, and local funds			
2. Provide a list of current federal, state, and local funds that impact literacy and how those funds will support specific activities listed in the application			
Does Not Meet Standard	Meets Standard	Exemplary Plan	Total
0-2	3-4	5	
Strengths:		Weaknesses:	

Part J: Eligible Schools and Head Start Programs Criterion			
1. The following criteria must be written into each application to ensure LEA and Head Start program applications are designed to serve high-poverty schools or a high-poverty population			
2. Which schools will be selected to receive MSRP grant funds? Describe the criteria used to make the choice. Head Start Programs: Describe the criteria used to make the choice			
3. Describe the plan for addressing the needs of eligible schools that will not be selected to receive MSRP funds. Describe the factors that most influenced the decision not to select these schools.			
Does Not Meet Standard	Meets Standard	Exemplary Plan	Total
0-2	3-4	5	
Strengths:		Weaknesses:	

Part K: Evidence Criterion			
The OPI requires all LEAs and Head Start programs to provide information on effective evidence-based literacy instruction. The following criteria will be written into each application and reflect:			
1. Implementation of successful evidence-based literacy instruction			
2. Use of evidence-based curriculum and materials			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Grades 6-12: Describe how the middle and high schools align their curriculum to the MT Standards for English Language Arts and other components of effective literacy instruction. • Grades K-5: Describe how the elementary school aligns their curriculum to the MT Standards for English Language Arts and other components of effective literacy instruction • Birth through Age 5: Describe how the proposed instructional content and materials support the MT Early Learning Guidelines and MT Standards for English Language Arts 			
Does Not Meet Standard	Meets Standard	Exemplary Plan	Total
0-2	3-4	5	
Strengths:		Weaknesses:	

Part L: Standards Criterion			
The OPI requires LEAs and Head Start programs to align the evidence-based curriculum being implemented to the MT State Standards for English Language Arts (Appendix 8) or MT Early Learning Guidelines (Appendix 9) and use them to develop their application. The chart and resources will be posted on the OPI Web site and explicitly reviewed during the application process. Click on the following link to view resources: http://www.opi.mt.gov/pdf/Instructional_Innovations/MSRP/Websites_Descrpt.pdf . The following criteria will be written into each application:			
1. Grades K-12: Describe the process LEAs will use to ensure alignment of the evidence-based curriculum to the MT Standards for English Language Arts			
2. Birth through Age 5: Describe the process that LEAs or Head Start programs will use to ensure the evidence-based curriculum is aligned to the Montana Early Learning Guidelines or MT Standards for English Language Arts			
Does Not Meet Standard	Meets Standard	Exemplary Plan	Total
0-2	3-4	5	
Strengths:		Weaknesses:	

Part M: Competitive Technology Priority			
The OPI will award up to five additional points for LEAs and Head Start Programs that propose to use technology to support principles of universal design to accommodate and support disadvantaged students and challenge all students. The following criteria will be written into each application:			
1. Describe the technology used to address student learning challenges			
2. Describe the evidence-based rationale for using that technology			
3. Describe the use of technology to increase student engagement and achievement			
4. Describe how technology will be used to increase teacher effectiveness			
Does Not Meet Standard	Meets Standard	Exemplary Plan	Total
0-2	3-4	5	
Strengths:		Weaknesses:	

SECTION III- BUDGET AND NARRATIVE

- A. (2 to 6 pages)- The applicant district must submit a budget that combines proposed expenditures of participating schools for all three years. Applicants are encouraged to use the three-column budget worksheet when considering all areas listed below.
- B. (6 pages)- The applicant must also submit a budget narrative/justification which presents a rationale for the amount and use of funds received under the grant.

Salaries

Personnel

- Stipends for staff to attend professional development identified within the grant narrative
- Salaries will only be allowed if the identified staff directly supports implementation of the MSRP activities and if sustainability of those components can be justified.

Combine the total costs of these areas and place the dollar figure in the “Salaries and Benefits” section of the budget page.

Operating Expenses

Travel and Professional Development: Estimate the total costs for professional development for this school or Head Start as described in your grant application.

- Include the costs of travel for Implementation Leadership Team members to attend bimonthly state level professional development in Helena.
- Include the costs of all professional development identified within the grant narrative.

Equipment

- ipads for Implementation Leadership Team (\$800 per member)
- Flip cameras for video reflection portfolio (1 per every 5 teachers @ \$300 per camera)
- Additional technology in subgrant application priority (Part M in grant narrative)

Supplies and Materials

- ISIP Assessment (\$5 per student), or AIMSweb or DIBELS costs
- MY Access! Writing for 8th and 11th grade students (\$20 per student)
- IWalkthrough system (Approx. \$1,000-\$3,500 per school/per year)
- Additional assessment materials identified in grant narrative
- Additional supplies and materials in grant narrative

Contractual

- Instructional Consultant Team Member (\$2,500 per day). See Funding and Support Table for appropriate number of days to include in the budget.

Funding and Support Table				
Number of Students or Children	Funds Needed Yearly	Number of On-site Support Days per School per Month from Instructional Consultant	Funds for Required MSRP Activities	Funds for Additional Needs identified in LEAs and Head Start programs subgrant application
1-200	\$250,000	2	\$100,000	\$150,000
201-500	\$300,000	4	\$125,000	\$175,000
500-750	\$375,000	5	\$150,000	\$225,000
751+	\$400,000	6	\$175,000	\$225,000

Successful Subgrantees must enter district, school, and early childhood center information onto the Federal Funding Accountability and Transparency Act (FFATA) Web site within one month of award notice. <http://www.fsrc.gov>

SECTION IV- STAFF ASSURANCES

I have participated in developing or reading the _____ (school or Early Childhood Center) application for a Montana Striving Readers Project Grant and agree to the requirements and commitments identified in the grant.

Signature of Superintendent

Date

Signature of Board Chair

Date

Signature of Principal

Date

Signature of Assistant Principal

Date

Signature of Assistant Principal

Date

Signature of Staff

Grade Level/Content

Date

Signature of Staff

Grade Level/Content

Date

Signature of Staff

Grade Level/Content

Date

Signature of Staff

Grade Level/Content

Date

Signature of Staff

Grade Level/Content

Date

Signature of Staff

Grade Level/Content

Date

Signature of Staff

Grade Level/Content

Date

Signature of Staff

Grade Level/Content

Date

_____ Signature of Staff	_____ Grade Level/Content	_____ Date
_____ Signature of Staff	_____ Grade Level/Content	_____ Date
_____ Signature of Staff	_____ Grade Level/Content	_____ Date
_____ Signature of Staff	_____ Grade Level/Content	_____ Date
_____ Signature of Staff	_____ Grade Level/Content	_____ Date
_____ Signature of Staff	_____ Grade Level/Content	_____ Date
_____ Signature of Staff	_____ Grade Level/Content	_____ Date
_____ Signature of Staff	_____ Grade Level/Content	_____ Date
_____ Signature of Staff	_____ Grade Level/Content	_____ Date

Number of staff:
Number of staff supporting this application:

Percent of staff supporting this application:



opi.mt.gov

MONTANA OFFICE OF PUBLIC INSTRUCTION

DENISE JUNEAU, SUPERINTENDENT

MONTANA STRIVING READERS PROJECT

PO Box 202501

HELENA, MT 59620-2501

WWW.OPI.MT.GOV